

Appl. No.: 09/945,413
Amdt. dated May 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 20, 2004

II. Remarks In Response to the Office Action

A. General Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

B. Claim Objections

Claim 2 stands objected for an informality. In response, claim 2 has been amended to recite -- a service application -- to show proper antecedent basis. In addition, claim 3 has been amended to show proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests withdraw of the objection to claim 2.

C. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,782,400 to Guess et al. ("Guess").

Applicant respectfully traverses the conclusion that Guess anticipates claims 1-20 in so far as Guess does not disclose all the limitations of independent claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 19, and 20, as amended.

Claims 1, 9 and 10 are respectively directed to a method, computer program, and system "for importing data from an origin to a destination by a user utilizing a network" and have been amended in an essentially the same manner. Claims 11, 19, and 20 are directed to a method, computer program, and system "for exporting data from an origin to a destination by a user utilizing a network" and have also been amended in an essentially the same manner.

For example, independent claim 1, as amended, is directed to a "method for importing data from an origin to a destination by a user utilizing a network." The destination is associated with a network-based customer relationship application. Data is identified "to be imported from the origin to the destination associated with the customer relationship application utilizing the network." A "set of predetermined rules associated with the customer relationship application" is identified. The data is then imported "from the origin to the destination associated with the

Appl. No.: 09/945,413
Amdt. dated May 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 20, 2004

customer relationship application utilizing the network in accordance with the set of predetermined rules." "[F]irst fields for the data in the origin" are mapped "to second fields for the destination," and "first field names of the mapped first fields" are translated "to second field names of the second fields." The imported data is stored "in memory at the destination accessible to the customer relationship application. "[T]he mapping and translating are customizable by the user such that the second field names and the second fields in which the imported data is stored in the memory at the destination are customizable by the user."

In contrast, Guess is directed to "a system and method for transferring data between server systems." Guess at Abstract. Guess discloses a "configuration system 50" that "allows a user...to designate configuration details to locate the data to be transferred." Guess at col. 6:23-27. "Thus, the user could particularly identify the location of a specific data file." Guess at col. 6:34-35. Guess also discloses rules for processing the data. *See* Guess at col. 7:12 to col. 8:4. "Once the data has been processed, it can be formatted into the second file format...Formatting system 110 utilizes predefined formatting rules to format the data into a...report format... that is more conducive to review by the recipients." Guess at col. 8:10-24. The formatting system 110 "uses the formatting rules to arrange the data in a particular order, fashion, etc. For example, the formatting rules could dictate that data should be arranged into a particular sequence of columns/rows..., typeface convention..., etc." Guess at col. 8:35-42. "[O]nce the data has been formatted into a report file, export system 112 will export the report file to the destination server system for review by the recipient(s)." Guess at col. 8:46-49. "Once the report file is received by the destination server system, the recipient(s) are free to view and/or manipulate the data therein." Guess at col. 8:66 to 9:1.

Guess fails to disclose that "mapping and translating" of fields and fields names between the origin and destination "are customizable by the user such that the second field names and the second fields in which the imported data is stored in the memory at the destination are customizable by the user." Instead, Guess discloses that "data [of a flat file] could be re-formatted into a more suitable 'report-format'" (col. 7:10-11) by identifying "selective segments of the data to be forwarded to the recipient" (col. 7:43-44) and by "arrang[ing] the data in a particular order, fashion, etc." (col. 8:36-37). Therefore, Guess fails to disclose that "mapping

Appl. No.: 09/945,413
Amtd. dated May 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 20, 2004

and translating" of fields and fields names between the origin and destination "are customizable by the user," as required in Applicants' claims.

In addition, Guess fails to disclose importing/exporting data for a network-based customer relationship application. Instead, Guess is directed to formatting data from a flat file into a report more conducive to review by the recipients. By contrast, Applicants' claims 1, 9, and 10 require importing data from an origin to a destination associated with a network-based customer relationship application. Also, Applicants' claims 1, 9, and 10 require that the data is stored "in memory at the destination accessible to the customer relationship application." Moreover, Applicants' claims 11, 19, and 20 require exporting data from an origin associated with a network-based customer relationship application to a destination. And, Applicants' claims 11, 19, and 20 require that the data is stored "in memory at the origin accessible to the customer relationship application." Therefore, Guess fails to disclose these limitations of Applicants' claims.

For at least these reasons, Applicants believe that claims 1-20 are in proper form for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner indicate the allowance of these claims in the next paper from the Office.

D. Conclusion

This Response is being filed with a request for a TWO-MONTH extension of time up to and including May 20, 2005. Accordingly, the undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application. Should any fees be due for any reason, the undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 501922, referencing order no. 149-0119US.

To facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

Appl. No.: 09/945,413
Amdt. dated May 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 20, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

May 20, 2005
Date


Sean McDermott
Registration No. 49,000

Customer No. 29855
Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Bruculieri, LLP
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77070
Direct: 832/446-2416
Fax: 832/446-2424

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office Facsimile No. 703-872-9396 on Date: <u>May 20, 2005</u>	
Signature <u>Rebecca Ginn</u>	